

**Nebraska Library Commission
2011 Library Improvement Grants**

Scoring Sheet

If you have any questions, contact Richard Miller, Library Development Director, 402-471-3175.

Application #: _____

Submitting Entity: _____

Reviewer: _____

Review Score

	Score	Maximum
1. Project Description		10
2. Project Justification		10
3. Project Audience Needs & Outcomes		10
4. Project Implementation		10
5. Project Evaluation		10
6. Community Support		10
7. Project Sustainability		10
8. Project Communication Plan		10
9. Project Budget		10
Total		90

Recommend for funding? Yes ☐ No ☐

Full or partial funding? Full ☐ Partial ☐

If partial, how much do you recommend?

Score each section on a scale starting with 0. A score of 0 would indicate that the application either does not include that particular piece, or that it is included but is inadequate.

1. Project Description [10 points]

- ☐ 10 Excellent. Application includes clear project summary.
- ☐ 5 Average. Project briefly defined.
- ☐ 0 Poor. Minimal description provided.

2. Project Justification [10 points]

- ☐ 10 Excellent. The project clearly meets one or more LRP goal.
- ☐ 5 Average. Project goals are loosely related to goals in the LRP.
- ☐ 0 Poor. No clear connection is made to goals in the LRP.

3. Project Target Audience [10 points]

- ☐ 10 Excellent. Application describes clearly the target audience, needs, how the need was determined.
- ☐ 5 Average. The target audience is described, but there is little supporting data to demonstrate need.
- ☐ 0 Poor. The audience and needs are not clearly identified.

4. Project Implementation [10 points]

- ☐ 10 Excellent. The action steps are reasonable and clearly explain how the project will be implemented, from start to finish. The plan describes involvement of stakeholders and partners, where applicable.
- ☐ 5 Average. Some details are provided about plans for implementation but it is either incomplete, or lacks important components.
- ☐ 0 Poor. Implementation is mentioned but steps are not clearly described.

5. Project Evaluation [10 points]

- ☐ 10 Excellent. In the evaluation plan outcomes and the methods for collecting and measuring evaluation information are clearly described and are reasonable.
- ☐ 5 Average. The evaluation plan mentions intended outcomes and data collection process but details are minimal.
- ☐ 0 Poorly defined and/or inappropriate.

6. Community Support [10 points]

- ☐ 10 Excellent. Community support is enthusiastic, appropriate and verified.
- ☐ 5 Average. Adequate information is provided to demonstrate community support of the project.
- ☐ 0 Minimal or no support demonstrated.

7. Project Sustainability [10 points]

- ☐ 10 Excellent plan for sustaining the project. There is a sound plan for sustaining the project's activities, supported with documentation where necessary.
- ☐ 5 Average. Describes an adequate plan for sustaining the project.
- ☐ 0 Inadequate or no plan for sustaining the project.

8. Project Communication Plan [10 points]

- ☐ 10 Excellent plan for communicating the purpose and intended outcomes of the project.
- ☐ 5 Average. Adequate plan for communicating about the project.
- ☐ 1 Inadequate plan for communication.

9. Project Budget [10 points]

- ☐ 10 Excellent. The budget addresses all aspects of costs involved, and provides supporting documentation to verify costs. The match is strong, accurate and verified.
- ☐ 5 Average. Most costs are included but either verification is missing or weak, or match is minimally described.
- ☐ 0 Poor. Budget information is provided but significant information is missing.